REMARKS

The invention of claim 1 is a system for creating an augmented reality display coupled with a firefighter's self-contained breathing apparatus (SCBA) mask. The invention combines a ,-head-mounted display, SCBA mask, and a head motion tracker coupled to the SCBA mask. Other claims add one or more cameras, and optional head phones. The invention comprises a display suitable for performing exercises, such as training of firefighters or other emergency first responders, in augmented reality.

In the rejection of claims 1-4, 7, 8, 9, 11, 13, and 15, the examiner states that the instrumented HMD described by Zhang combined with a motion tracking unit from Kiernan is obvious to one skilled in the art. In fact, Kiernan's device is not a head motion tracking device coupled to a SCBA mask as in claim 1 of the applicant's invention, rather it is simply a motion detector. The difference is significant, as Kiernan's device simply detects the presence of motion for use in determining whether the user has been incapacitated and rendered motionless; it is not a head motion tracking device and could not actually track any motion. The applicant's invention uses an actual motion tracking device to determine precise position and orientation of the user's head in three-dimensional space. The motion tracking device also allows the applicant's invention to precisely display information to the user that is anchored to and referenced to the real world. Such integration is not obvious to one skilled in the art, and the rejection is unfounded. Accordingly, the references, whether looked at individually or in combination, neither disclose nor suggest the applicant's claim 1. As claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by the references, claim 1 must, under the law of 35 U.S.C. section 103, be patentable.

In the rejection of claims 5, 6, 10, 12, 14, and 16, the examiner states that the extension of the design disclosed by Zhang, in combination with Kiernan, can be extended in view of Waldren to comprise a stereoscopic view. In the above contention, the applicant has shown that the disclosures of Zhang and Kiernan in combination do not comprise adequate prior art over the applicant's invention, and as such, any extension to provide stereoscopic view is not addressed by the examiner's references.

Accordingly, all of the claims are allowable. Early and favorable action is respectfully requested.

If for any reason this Response is found to be incomplete, or if at any time it appears that a telephone conference with counsel would help advance prosecution, please telephone the undersigned in Westborough, Massachusetts at (508) 898-1818.

Very Truly Yours,

Brian M. Dingman Reg. No. 32,729